After the apocalypse; our misguided collapse fantasies

Benjamin James

December 4, 2025

We live in an era saturated with predictions of collapse, from global pandemics and political failures to societal dissolution or technological catastrophes. These narratives circulate with remarkable velocity, completely detached from any material analysis and driven instead by a deeper metaphysical confusion, our belief that complex systems can fall into something like nothingness. What most people call "collapse" is not, in fact, a description of disruption but a projection of voidhood, a psychological attempt to imagine the total erasure of order, continuity, and structure. This projection persists because we have not collectively disentangled the difference between structural breakdown and ontological annihilation. The former is part of the natural dynamics of complex systems; the latter is impossible. However, our cultural imagination treats them as interchangeable, and, in doing so, nourishes anxieties that appear rational while resting on impossible premises.

The first mistake is the assumption that society is monolithic and fragile, that it is like a thin membrane stretched over chaos, easily torn by any sufficiently sharp event. This picture is emotionally compelling but structurally false. Real societies consist of dense, overlapping networks that are logistical, institutional, informational, and ecological. They possess redundancies at every scale. They reconfigure under stress rather than vanish. No empirical collapse, from pandemics to wars to economic crises, has ever produced a uniform, global void. Even the most catastrophic shocks generate adaptation in some regions, stability in others, and rapid reorganization across the whole. But because the modern individual often experiences their own life as precarious, economically, relationally, or institutionally, that felt precarity becomes a lens through which the entire world is interpreted. The fragility of one's personal world becomes the assumed fragility of the world itself.

This leads to the second confusion, the substitution of political impotence for metaphysical threat. When people feel they cannot influence their institutions, cannot meaningfully participate in governance, and cannot rely on social structures to protect them, uncertainty

takes on a cosmic scale. Political dissatisfaction becomes ontologized. Instead of "I don't trust the system," one begins to sense "the system is collapsing," and finally "the world itself is fraying." Despair over political agency transforms into fantasies of catastrophic reset. These fantasies are attractive because they resolve the tension between a desire for change and a sense of powerlessness. If the system cannot be repaired, perhaps it will be destroyed by forces outside human control.

Collapse narratives flourish precisely when political imagination has narrowed. If one cannot picture institutional transformation, one begins to picture institutional erasure. If one cannot envision social resilience, one begins to fear, or even secretly wish for, a dramatic break that "hits the reset button." In this way, collapse becomes a surrogate for political desire. It is not an empirical forecast; it is a symptom of a culture unable to imagine renewal without destruction.

Beneath these cultural and political currents lies an even more fundamental mistake. Most people implicitly believe that order is something imposed from above rather than something that emerges from within. In this worldview, systems remain coherent only so long as some external force, a government, technology, divine intention, or in the most modern form, a computational "simulator," actively maintains them. Remove that force, and everything collapses instantly into chaos, but the universe does not work this way. Coherence is not imposed; it is accumulated. It arises from feedback, persistence, adaptation, constraint, and the energetic and informational dynamics that govern all complex systems. Once coherence exists, it does not vanish because a single structure fails. It propagates into new configurations. It redistributes itself. It persists because persistence is baked into the dynamics of reality itself.

The imagined void of collapse, a sudden reversion to nothingness, is an artifact of treating reality as fragile and externally maintained, but reality is fundamentally stable. Entropy disrupts it, yes, but does not annihilate it; it merely shifts the configuration landscape through which the system must navigate. Collapse, when it occurs, is never a dissolution into nothing but a transition into a different basin of coherence. This is not philosophy for its

own sake; it is the observable behavior of every adaptive system from ecosystems to economies.

Our social imagination, however, continues to portray collapse as something closer to ontological cancellation. That portrayal fulfills several psychological functions. First, it simplifies an overwhelmingly complex world into a binary of either intact or gone. Humans often struggle with gradual degradation, distributed failure, partial collapse, and nonlinear recovery. These trajectories lack narrative clarity. A clean break is easier to conceptualize and easier to fear. It is emotionally legible. It mirrors the structure of personal crisis. One day life is normal; the next day everything feels different. This personal phenomenology gets projected onto global systems, even though global systems evolve through rhythms entirely unlike personal ones.

Second, collapse fantasies provide moral fervor. When people feel that society is corrupt, decadent, or unjust, catastrophe becomes a purification myth. The world will be forced back to some imagined authenticity once the detritus of modernity is cleared away. This story is ancient. It appears across civilizations in our religious apocalypses, revolutionary dreams, and utopian resets. Modern secular collapse narratives recycle the same logic simply using a new grammar of grid failures, pandemics, and civil breakdown. Hidden in each is the idea that destruction can cleanse, but history offers no such redemption. Actual collapse exacerbates every vulnerability, entrenches every inequality, and corrodes every fragile norm. It is entropy, not purification.

Third, collapse fantasies offer escape. They invert the pressures of contemporary life, economic burdens, technological overload, and social fragmentation and help us imagine a simpler world where survival replaces complexity. This fantasy is particularly appealing in societies with high levels of burnout and low levels of communal cohesion. The desire for collapse is not a desire for destruction; it is a desire for relief. It signals exhaustion more than nihilism.

These narratives persist not only because they soothe individual anxieties but because they resonate with our broader metaphysical confusion about nothingness. The very idea of “everything stopping” carries an implicit belief that the cessation of a system can produce a

state of pure void, but nothingness, in this strict philosophical sense, is impossible. There is no scenario in which a complex system falls into non-being. There is only transition. Failure is always embodied, never abstract. Even the most brutal disruptions produce new patterns. There is no vacuum waiting behind civilization. There are only other forms of civilization.

This insight destabilizes the emotional foundation of collapse thinking. When you realize that no amount of disruption can generate the metaphysical void that people unconsciously fear, collapse loses its existential thrill and its existential threat. It becomes what it actually is, a redistribution of coherence, restructuring of systems, and transformation rather than annihilation. This is not to trivialize genuine suffering. Collapse is painful, destructive, and destabilizing, but it is not ontologically terminal.

Understanding this allows for a reframing of political and social fears. Instead of fixating on impossible scenarios of global voidhood, we can focus on genuine vulnerabilities like supply chain fragility, political polarization, public health capacity, and climate risk without folding them into metaphysical catastrophism. This shift has practical consequences. A society that imagines collapse as ontological erasure will behave irrationally by hoarding, withdrawing, abandoning institutions, amd indulging in fatalism. A society that understands collapse as structural transition can plan, adapt, and reform. The difference between these orientations is the difference between panic and agency.

Politically, collapse fantasies are corrosive because they undermine the willingness to maintain the very systems that prevent collapse. If people believe everything is destined to fail catastrophically, investment in institutions appears pointless, cooperation appears futile, long-term thinking evaporates, and cynicism becomes the default posture rather than a political stance. This is how belief in collapse becomes a self-fulfilling pathology. Not because collapse occurs, but because the preconditions for resilience are systematically weakened by the expectation of failure.

There is also a subtler danger. Collapse narratives create fertile ground for extremism. If people believe the system is doomed, extremists gain rhetorical power by presenting themselves as midwives of the coming renewal. They promise order after the fall, clarity after the chaos, meaning after the void. The imagined nothingness becomes an ideological

opportunity. When collapse is treated as a metaphysical reset rather than a structural process, those who promise a new world gain license to abandon the responsibilities of the current one.

Against all of this stands a simple corrective. Reality is robust. Coherence is robust. Emergent systems do not collapse into nothingness because nothingness is not a destination available to them. Collapse is always a transition into another configuration of order. Recognizing this dissolves the metaphysical anxiety at the core of our collapse narratives. It forces us to see that the void we imagine does not exist. Not physically, socially, or politically.

What remains, once the fantasy is removed, is a clearer picture of our actual situation. We live in a complex, adaptive, globally interconnected system that is capable of absorbing enormous shocks. The greatest threats we face are not existential voids but maladaptive responses to perceived voids, withdrawal from collective responsibility, abandonment of political agency, amplification of fear, and erosion of trust. The task is not to prepare for nothingness but to strengthen coherence, reinforce the feedback loops that sustain systems, and cultivate resilience rather than dread.

The metaphysical fantasy of collapse has outlived its usefulness. It is time to replace it with a more accurate picture of reality; one in which systems persist, reconfigure, and continue, even under extreme stress. This picture is not merely comforting; it is correct. Once it is understood, the allure of apocalyptic thinking will begin to fade, and collapse will lose its status as an existential horizon. It will become, instead, a call to deepen our understanding of our world, and to anchor our political and social imagination in the real dynamics of how worlds endure.

References

James, B. (2025). On the incoherence of Nothingness and the natural ascent of Being. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMOTI-3